

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/828,521	NAPADENSKY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Olga Asinovsky	1711	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Olga Asinovsky.

(3) Avery Goldstein, Ph.D.

(2) William Adams.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Olga Asinovsky*

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed how to control the hydrophilic properties at high sulfonation level over 70% in the (A) block copolymer for obtaining high proton conductivity and better fuel cell performance of the resulting composition. The (B) block of the polyisobutylene works differently than polyisoprene in Storey invention. Although references disclose that the sulfonated block polymer may be neutralized with alkali metal, none discloses Cesium cation. In order to assist the office to better analyze the specific cation in the present claim 7 the proposed amendment would be favorably considered by the examiner.